



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/832,387	04/11/2001	Louiss R. Jackson, JR.	COMP:0205	4526

7590 02/13/2003

Robert A. Van Someren
Fletcher, Yoder & Van Someren
P.O. Box 692289
Houston, TX 77269-2289

EXAMINER

VORTMAN, ANATOLY

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2835

DATE MAILED: 02/13/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/832,387

Applicant(s)

JACKSON,, LOUISS R.

Examiner

Anatoly Vortman

Art Unit

2835

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☐ Claim(s) 1-51 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☐ Claim(s) 1-51 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on ____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) ____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). ____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: ____.

Art Unit: 2835

DETAILED ACTION

Amendments

1. By amendment filed on 12/26/02 (paper # 5), claims 1 and 46 have been amended.

Claims 1-51 are pending in the instant application.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1-51, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

US/5,375,076 to Goodrich et al., (Goodrich) in view of US/6,396,472 to Jacklin.

Regarding claims 1, 2, 12, 19, and 21, Goodrich disclosed (Fig. 14-17) a computing apparatus, comprising:

a housing (20) comprising a display (26) and a plurality of computing devices (42, 44,46), wherein the display (26) is coupled to a side of the housing (20) and the housing (20) has a slim thickness; and a mounting assembly (36) for the housing (20) configured to facilitate a desired upright orientation of the display (26) and a shallow horizontal space consumption of the

housing (20), but did not disclose a mount structure configured to mount the housing on a substantially vertical surface.

Jacklin disclosed a computer display (Fig. 1 and 2) having a mount structure (31) configured to mount said display on a vertical surface (wall) (column 7, lines 39+).

Since the inventions of Goodrich and of Jacklin are from the same field of endeavor (computer displays), the purpose of the mount structure configured to mount said display on a vertical surface as taught by Jacklin would be recognized in the invention of Goodrich.

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the computer art at the time the invention was made to supplement said display of Goodrich with the mount structure as taught by Jacklin in order to facilitate mounting of the display of Goodrich on the vertical surface.

Regarding claim 37, Goodrich disclosed a computer system (Fig. 14-17), comprising:
a computer enclosure (20) having a shallow depth; a display screen (26) coupled to the computer enclosure (20); a plurality of electronics (42, 44, 46) disposed within the shallow depth; and a support assembly (36) configured to facilitate a substantially vertical orientation of the display screen (26) and a slim horizontal depth consumption by the computer enclosure (20).

Regarding claims 3, 8, 9, 10, 22, 23, and 38, Goodrich disclosed that the housing (20) embodies a substantially flat panel having a flat display screen (26) with a viewable area configured for personal computer system, (Fig. 14, 16, 17).

Regarding claim 4, 6, 7, 25, 26, 40, and 41, Goodrich disclosed that said housing (20) comprising a plurality of modular bays (receptacles) for at least a portion of a portable (desktop) computer component (42, 44, 46), (Fig. 14).

Art Unit: 2835

Regarding claim 5, Goodrich disclosed a slot (covered by door (40)) for a compact computer component (column 4, lines 51+).

Regarding claim 11, Goodrich disclosed a display angle adjustment assembly (36) coupled to the housing (20) for orienting the display in a desired viewing angle, (Fig. 9).

Regarding claims 13, 14, and 28, Goodrich disclosed a motherboard (52) with a processor (inherited in the structure, since any computer has a processor).

Regarding claim 15, Goodrich disclosed a data storage device (44).

Regarding claims 16, 29, and 42, Goodrich disclosed a battery (i.e. a mobile computer component), (50), (Fig. 13).

Regarding claims 17 and 31, Goodrich disclosed a port (48) configured for communication with an external electronic device.

Regarding claims 18 and 32, Goodrich disclosed a wireless communication assembly for interacting with peripheral devices (column 4, lines 12+).

Regarding claims 20, 34, and 44, Goodrich disclosed a horizontal mount structure (36) for mounting the housing (20) on a substantially horizontal surface.

Regarding claims 24, 27, and 39, Goodrich disclosed compact computer modular devices (bodies) (42, 44) adapted for removable insertion into, and coupling with, the housing (20).

Regarding claim 30, Goodrich disclosed that the computing devices comprise software (column 4, lines 32+).

Regarding claims 33 and 43, Goodrich disclosed vertical mount structure (36).

Regarding claim 36, Goodrich disclosed a keyboard (24) for communicatively coupling to a port (28) of the housing (20).

Regarding claims 35 and 45, Goodrich disclosed a slim peripheral device (24) configured for communicatively coupling to a port (28) of the housing (20), wherein the slim peripheral device (24) has a mounting structure (38) configured to facilitate a substantially vertical positioning of the slim peripheral device (24), (Fig. 17).

Regarding claims 46-51, the method steps recited in the claims are necessitated by the device structure as disclosed by Goodrich in view of Jacklin.

Response to Arguments

4. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-18, 20-48, 50, and 51 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Applicant's arguments regarding claims 19 and 49 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

The main thrust of the Applicant's arguments regarding claims 19 and 49 is directed to the fact that combination of references was improper (p. 8, lines 15-20 of the Amendment) e.g. that art is non-analogous and that there is no motivation to combine the references.

Firstly, the Examiner would like to direct the Applicant's attention to the fact that references of Goodrich et al. and of Jacklin are from the same field of endeavor, since both disclosed computer displays (see Fig. 7 of Jacklin for CPU (109), memory (113), network controller (119), etc.)

Secondly, in response to the Applicant's argument that there is no suggestion to combine the references, the Examiner recognizes that references cannot be arbitrarily combined and that

Art Unit: 2835

there must be some reason why one skilled in the art would be motivated to make the proposed combination of primary and secondary references. *In re Nomiya*, 184 USPQ 607 (CCPA 1975).

However, there is no requirement that a motivation to make the modification be expressly articulated. The test for combining references is what the combination of disclosures taken as a whole would suggest to one of ordinary skill in the art. *In re McLaughlin*, 170 USPQ 209 (CCPA 1971). References are evaluated by what they suggest to one versed in the art, rather than by their specific disclosures. *In re Bozek*, 163 USPQ 545 (CCPA) 1969.

In this case, the mountings (31) of Jacklin would definitely suggest to one versed in the computer art to modify display of Goodrich et al., since as depicted on Fig. 17 of Goodrich et al., said display may be positioned separately from the notebook computer, thus it may be hanged on the wall in order to save space on the working surface.

Conclusion

5. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37

Art Unit: 2835

CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Anatoly Vortman whose telephone number is 703-308-7824. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:30-6:00, Monday-Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mr. Darren Schuberg can be reached on 703-308-4815. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-305-3431 for regular communications and 703-305-3432 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-1782.

Anatoly Vortman
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2835

A.V.
February 10, 2003

1/12/03